

THE
ERRORS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

BY
DR. BARR MEADOWS ;

PHYSICIAN TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR DISEASES OF THE SKIN ;
AUTHOR OF "ERUPTIONS : THEIR RATIONAL TREATMENT" (SEVENTH EDITION) ;
"AFFECTIONS OF THE DIGESTIVE ORGANS ;" ETC., ETC., ETC.

Hominis errare, insipientis vero in errore perseverare.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON :
G. HILL, 154, WESTMINSTER BRIDGE ROAD.

1876.

P R E F A C E .

DID Homœopathy rely alone on reason for support, its very inanity would obviate all necessity of refutation ; for, though belief in things incomprehensible may, and ever will, retain a place amongst mankind, scientific ignorance is fast dissolving before the light of knowledge.

But its professors, forced to acknowledge its failure as a scientific truth, fall back on credulity and superstition for support, and holding up *Similia*—this modern serpent, like to its predecessor in nothing but the brass—claim its acknowledgment as a truth of divine origin, “a Great Something,” “God’s universal and inflexible law of cure.”

We prosecute certain “Peculiar People” because they have more faith in prayer than they have in medicines, but it is, as yet, perfectly legal to let any one die under the treatment of a practitioner who may choose to prescribe, in the most dangerous diseases, the decillionth of a grain of charcoal, of coffee, or of chalk!!!

47, *Victoria Street,*

Westminster.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/b30573567>

THE ERRORS

OF

HOMŒOPATHY.

HOMŒOPATHY is either a huge lie, or a divine truth !” *
But what is Homœopathy? The invention, discovery, or hallucination, of one Hahnemann, a German, by whom it was promulgated as a new system of medicine.

He inculcated that, as various medicinal agents are capable of producing in a healthy person symptoms similar to those presented by disease, so every disease is capable of being cured by such medicine as would produce symptoms analogous to those by which it is

* Dr. Eadon.

characterized. “*Similia similibus curantur*”—likes by likes are cured—such is the dogma.

Thus the fundamental principle of Hahnemann led naturally, and of necessity, to the enunciation of the efficacy of infinitesimal doses. “When Hahnemann first commenced to prescribe in accordance with the valuable law which he had propounded—viz., ‘that diseases should be cured by like agents, which, when exhibited to the healthy in comparatively large and frequent doses, are capable of producing effects analogous (or similar) thereto,’ he employed the same doses as are ordinarily used in the old mode of practice; but from the circumstance that these, *when given in accordance with the above law*, were repeatedly productive of serious constitutional disturbance, he commenced to administer the remedies in smaller and smaller quantities, until at length he fell upon the plan of seeking to moderate their activity by adding a non-medicinal substance to the medicine, in certain proportions, and then again adding and subdividing until the proportion of medicine was reduced to an extremely minute quantity. At first he limited himself in preparing these dilutions or attenuations (or potencies), to mingling intimately and carefully, by

“ rubbing and pounding for a given period, one grain of
“ the medicinal substance (as, for instance, sulphur) with
“ ninety-nine grains of the non-medicinal material (sugar
“ of milk), and prescribing a very small quantity of this
“ preparation in the cases under his treatment; but, on
“ finding that the medicine, even in this attenuated form,
“ still repeatedly produced too powerful an effect, he
“ further prepared a second attenuation, by taking one
“ grain of the first, as above prepared, and adding it to and
“ carefully mixing it with other ninety-nine grains of sugar
“ of milk; and then a *third*, by again taking one grain of
“ the foregoing, and triturating it with ninety-nine fresh
“ grains of sugar of milk. In the case of vegetable sub-
“ stances (such as Aconitum), he took one drop of the
“ strong tincture, and mixed it intimately by powerful
“ succussion with ninety-nine drops of pure alcohol, to
“ form the first attenuation, and so on.

“ Notwithstanding the minute subdivision of the medicine
“ in the third attenuation, Hahneman still found it occa-
“ sionally too active, and was thereby induced to go on
“ from attenuation to attenuation, in the hope of arriving
“ at a point at which the medicines might be administered
“ without the risk of producing those painful and *dangerous*
“ aggravations which followed the employment of the

“ *ordinary doses* of such medicines as Arsenic, Mercury,
“ Belladonna, etc., etc. But even the thirtieth attenuation
“ (formerly the limit determined by Hahnemann) far from
“ having lost all efficacy, is in reality perhaps more
“ frequently productive of too energetic an effect than
“ the lower attenuations (viz., the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 6th, &c.);
“ provided always, as before remarked, it is administered
“ in accordance with the law of similitudes, *alias*, the law
“ for the selection of specifics.” *

Here we have acknowledged the fact that medicines, when administered on Homœopathic principles in large or ordinary doses,—such doses, in short, as produce effects similar or simulating the symptoms of the disease for which Hahnemann recommended them,—are anything but curative in their action, causing rather “ *dangerous* “ *aggravations.*”

Such being the case, and the fallacy of the new theory so sadly apparent, it is not to be wondered at that, in infinitesimal or impotent doses, he sought to hide the self-evident contradiction of his own invention.

But here again rose another difficulty: how to gain belief in inert quantities of medicines? To avoid dan-

* Laurie's Epitome of Homœopathic Domestic Medicine.

gerous aggravations” of the disease, the dose must be inoperative; but how gain credence in the curative properties of an infinitesimal dose?

Mark well the species of argument by which this is sought to be explained! “The advantage of the above
“mode of preparation is not confined to the *tastelessness*
“and *smallness*, yet sufficiency, of the dose; for it is,
“moreover, placed beyond the pale of dispute that, as a
“very general rule, this minute subdivision and segregation
“of the particles renders the medicines *more efficacious*
“than when they are administered in a cruder form,
“even though in accordance with the law of similarities.

“Further, an acquisition of very important medicaments
“is thus obtained, and which would otherwise have
“remained as useless to the homœopathist as they are to
“the allopathist—we allude to such substances as *Charcoal*,
“*Lycopodium* (chiefly employed by our allopathic brethren
“as a non-medicinal covering for pills), *Chalk*, *Platinum*,
“etc., etc., which in their native state possess little or no
“medicinal power, but nevertheless become valuable and
“powerful medicines after trituration.

“The fact that the *attenuations* are, generally speaking,
“of greater efficacy in the treatment of disease than the
“primitive unattenuated or undiluted medicinal substances,

“ has led to the supposition that the medicinal particles
“ are not only rendered more potently curative, and, it
“ may be added, more capable of being absorbed into the
“ system, by being so minutely subdivided, but that a
“ medicinal property is thereby communicated to the
“ entire mass of the vehicle (or matter with which the
“ medicine is mixed up, viz., the sugar of milk, or the
“ spirits of wine); and, consequently, that the doses
“ employed in Homœopathy are in reality not so extremely
“ small as would seem apparent. The transmission of
“ medicinal virtue from attenuation to attenuation has been
“ considered by many to depend on magnetic influence,
“ and the preparation of Homœopathic medicines likened
“ unto that of artificial magnets. A natural magnet
“ can effectually magnetize thousands of bars of steel,
“ and these in their turn can be made to impart their
“ properties to an unlimited number of others. Again,
“ as in the process of rendering the tempered steel
“ magnetic, it is *essential to rub it with care in a certain*
“ *direction* for the purpose of endowing it with the
same properties as the loadstone; in like manner,
“ unless the homœopathic remedies are prepared in the
“ *peculiar mode recommended by Hahnemann* and others,
“ their integrity is prone to be seriously impaired, if not
“ utterly destroyed.

“ Without wishing to place any particular stress upon
“ the circumstance, the author may yet be permitted
“ to wind up this subject by appending what may be
“ considered as a sort of rough analogy to the main-
“ tenance of medicinal power throughout a series of
“ homœopathic attenuations; viz., when, in the making
“ of bread according to the usual method, it is impossible
“ to procure yeast, or any other substance which is
“ capable of producing fermentation, as is frequently
“ the case on board ship at sea, it is customary to retain
“ a small portion of the dough which has previously
“ undergone fermentation (from the action of yeast or
“ other leaven which has been the medium of accom-
“ plishing the desired object in the first instance), in order
“ that it may be thrown amongst the flour and water
“ required for the next batch, to communicate its borrowed
“ properties to the mass, and so on successively for a
“ considerable period. May it not be questioned here
“ also, by those who are always so ready to sneer at the
“ Homœopathic attenuations, how much of the *original*
“ *leaven* could there be detected in the ultimate mass
“ of matter which has been caused to ferment by the
“ agency of the small piece of dough kept back from the
“ preceding lump ? ” *

* Dr. Laurie,

So that we are expected to understand that infinitesimal doses are more powerful, because more readily absorbed into the system, than ordinary doses ;—now if dilution facilitates absorption in this manner, how is it that contagions are universally allowed to be rendered more or less active in proportion as the ventilation is efficient or otherwise? “The most important practical
“ results of the experiments made by Dr. Haygarth, and
“ others, for determining the absolute distances to which
“ the power of the contagion extends in different dis-
“ orders, was, that *where ventilation is complete*, in other
“ words, where the gaseous poison is freely diluted with
“ atmospheric air, the sphere of its operation is very
“ limited.”* But were it otherwise ; we are told that the less easily absorbed, and consequently less powerful, ordinary doses, are obliged to be diminished to prevent their “too energetic effect.” Ordinary doses are too energetic and cause “dangerous aggravations ;” therefore dilute, and so give them more potency to prevent this result. Surely stricture of the œsophagus has no place in the nosology of Homœopathy !

* Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Physic, by Sir Thomas Watson, Bart., M.D., Physician Extraordinary to the Queen, etc., etc.

The *second* plea put forward to substantiate the efficacy of infinitesimal doses, is the supposed communication of properties from the medicinal substance to the non-medicinal vehicle, so that “the doses employed in “Homœopathy are in reality not so extremely small as “would seem apparent.” The logic of this is about on a par with that of the preceding proposition. What, in the name of reason, is the use of all these rubbings with care in a certain direction—to the left, we presume—if, after all, the medicinal property is communicated to the entire mass? Surely it would save a vast amount of time and trouble to omit the complicated process and administer the original substance!

And how is this imaginary communication of properties sought to be accounted for? By imagining a process similar to fermentation, or an action like unto that of communication of magnetic influence from the loadstone to bars of steel; so that the clients of the Homœopaths are again offered a selection of suppositions—*they pay their money and they make their choice*. Magnetic influence, however, it should be remembered, is not a property communicable from the loadstone to indifferent substances. An iron ore itself, iron alone is capable of borrowing its properties. So also with yeast or leaven: a substance in

the act of decomposition, it is reproduced by its admixture with, and action upon, a liquid or substance, *of which its own constituents* form an integral part; its addition to other matters wanting this essential—similitude of constitution—is not followed by any such augmentation or multiplication, even though fermentation be produced. Thus, the addition of yeast to a solution of sugar (such solution being free from gluten), will give rise to alcoholic fermentation; but, instead of being augmented during the process, the yeast will disappear. Does, then, this similarity of constitution exist between alcohol or sugar of milk and *all* the Homœopathic medicinal substances? Certainly not. This assumption of the transmission of properties is but, in fact, a reproduction and revival of the theory of transmutations which, in ages past, existed in the visions of the alchemists. Reason and science have long since proved that chemical decomposition is the only transformation possible in nature; whilst identity of property is an impossibility, unless combined with identity of composition.

Personal experience being at all times preferable to precept or to theory, let the man who believes otherwise make the experiment; let him try if, with the most careful rubbing and preparation, he can succeed in com-

municating the physical and chemical properties—upon which their medicinal action depends—from arsenic or gold to, the unlike vehicle, sugar of milk. One grain of gold, and one ton of the vehicle, should exhibit him a Cræsus, or should prove him—something else.

Again, vaccination also is claimed as “an operation purely Homœopathic,” and also, probably, as an instance of the potency of minute doses. To explain the fallacy of such an assumption, it is necessary to understand the nature of the vaccine virus, and its mode of action.

First, then, Variola or Small-pox is one of those diseases to which we apply the term “zymotic;” that is to say, it is occasioned by a virus or poison introduced from without into the system, where, coming in contact with *its own original elements*, it communicates to them its particular action, viz., fermentation or decomposition.

This process of alteration, once commenced, ceases not until the whole of such ingredients contained in the body are involved; nor does the disease or constitutional disturbance induced, terminate, until such altered matter is expelled.

These elements, which originally entered into the composition of the blood as component parts, once eliminated, it follows that no contagion, natural or artificial, can again

give rise to the disease ; unless, indeed, these self-same ingredients should be spontaneously reproduced, and, after the lapse of time, again become subjected to the action of the poison to which they hold such definite relationship.

Cow-pox and Small-pox are essentially the same disease—the vaccine virus the same as the virus of small-pox, but rendered mild by passing through the system of the cow ; so that in the operation of vaccination we introduce a modified variolus poison into the blood, by which means a modified fermentative action is induced, and the elimination of those peculiar elements necessary to the propagation and multiplication of the Small-pox poison being effected, no infection need afterwards be dreaded : the combustible matter absent, ignition is impossible.

This at once explains how so small a portion of the matter used in inoculation is capable of giving rise to effects tantamount to those that would equally ensue were the agent exhibited in larger quantity. With regard to the assumption of vaccination as a Homœopathic measure, what possible connection can there exist between its prophylactic or preventive action and the *cure* of Small-pox ? For *were it* curative in that disease, it would still be no proof of Similia, but rather would tend to shew that sames were cured by sames ; whilst, if “likes by likes are cured,” and

if even Cow-pox is not identical but only similar to Small-pox, then should the former be *curative*, and not preventive only, of the latter disease.

Few men have suffered more in the cause of humanity than Edward Jenner. In life the subject of ingratitude and neglect—in death he should at least be free from thus having posthumous honour (?) thrust upon him, and his name emblazoned amongst infinitesimal celebrities as a practitioner of Similia. Thus runs the proverb, “*De mortuis nil nisi bonum.*”

But, alas! *we are instructed* that certain therapeutical agents are removed beyond the reach of *our* ill-used patients; however, let us not be downcast at the melancholy announcement—in ordinary doses “they possess little or no medicinal power”—the *Homœopaths* administer their remedies to remove similar symptoms to those produced in health by their exhibition—*ergo*, as in health they produce no symptoms, so there can exist no disease for them to cure.

The insupportable argument of infinitesimal sufficiency, and the evident ill effects of the system when carried out with ordinary doses, leave the disciples of Hahnemann in a predicament resembling somewhat the uncomfortable position of Midas when judging between Pan and Apollo.

Like him they desert the sciences,—have they a like reward?

Minimum doses are evidently very convenient in practice, and very unnecessary in theory; and we have two divisions of the Homœopathic world, comprising those who accept the infinitesimal theory, and are skin-proof against any amount of reasoning or ridicule, and those who, discarding this portion of the creed of their “immortal master,” care not for “dangerous aggravations,” provided it proves to their own benefit and edification—which no doubt it does.

But there is a third and still more remarkably ingenious method by which to escape from between this Charybdis and Scylla in the road to *Homœopathic distinction*. Thus a gentleman of this persuasion manfully defends his sect: “The practice of medicine, according to the law of similars, alone constitutes Homœopathy; whether the medicine be given in large or small doses has nothing to do with the question of Principle. The dose given may be a *globule*, or a *pill the size of an orange*, or a mixture with a single drop of the mother tincture, or one with two-third tincture and one-third water; and yet the practice in each alike is Homœopathy. The medicines may be given in their poisonous forms, or so dynamized that the

“poisonous quantities may be reduced to their minimum
“point of intensity, while, during the process, thousands
“of new surfaces may be developed, possessing transcen-
“dental recuperative powers: and yet medicine when
“given in either of these two forms—the crude or the
“dynamized—if administered according to the law of
“Similia, would be strictly in accordance with Homœo-
“pathy. The medicines may be given separately, or
“those which are analogues in alternation, either with
“a long or a shorter time intervening, and, if administered
“on the law of similars, this practice would be perfectly
“Homœopathic. The same medicine which is given
“internally may be applied externally or locally, so
“as to be taken up by the absorbents; and yet, if
“given on God’s inflexible law of ‘similars,’ this practice
“also would be legitimate Homœopathy. The medicine
“may be given by olfaction, as was often done by Hahne-
“mann; or ordered to be taken by this self-same
“Hahnemann, as in the case of his friend the Rector of
“Wickwar, in two-grain doses and each mode is purely
“Homœopathic, and was the practice even of the great
“founder of Homœopathy himself. The Homœopathic
“law—to practise according to which is alone Homœo-
“pathy—hath its adjuncts and accessories. But these

“ adjuncts or appendages are not that Great Something of
“ which they are the mere adjunct or appendage. One
“ might as well confound the trappings of a horse with the
“ horse itself; the material body, with the mighty internal
“ spirit which is its great motive power; the planets,
“ with the great central sun around which they revolve—
“ as confound the law of healing—God’s inflexible and
“ invariable law of Cure—with a number of adjuncts or
“ accessories which experience has suggested, the better
“ to work out the law with greater effect, and make
“ more apparent to the minds of men than its origin is
“ divine.”

In a word, Homœopaths may administer ordinary doses of medicines *which they, and they alone*, consider to produce symptoms like to those presented by the disease, but when these give rise to “dangerous aggravations” they are to be diluted to that degree that they no longer produce their ill effects. Truly a most satisfactory reading of the “divine truth,” promulgated by the “immortal Hahnemann!” The Rational system of Medicine is true Homœopathy whilst its measures can in any manner be construed as Similia; but infinitesimals are preferable when Similia, otherwise applied, would cause “serious constitutional disturbance.”

The attenuations being thus accepted or rejected as they are essential or otherwise, let us turn our attention to the principle—that “Great Something”—“God’s inflexible and invariable law of cure,” about which there is, or should be, no discord amongst the *followers*: “*Similia similibus curantur*”—likes by likes are cured. Then to cure a symptom, or a disease presenting a set of symptoms, it is but reasonable to suppose that a medicine should be given *in such a manner* that it would in a healthy person cause a state resembling that we desire to remedy.

But, unfortunately, the medicines which are said to produce symptoms having *some* degree of similarity to those of the idiopathic or natural disorder, *so given*, cause “dangerous aggravation,” instead of amelioration. What then?—dilute, diminish, give a smaller dose;—still aggravating “aggravation” is the result; again, diminish, then again dilute, until at length it no longer produce these effects—*now*, the disease, *no longer made worse*, may or may not get better.

But would this diminished dose produce symptoms analogous in a healthy person? By no means. Where, then, the like that is to cure the like? Rather is it not evident that the more *unlike* the original dose—that

supposed capable of giving rise to symptoms resembling the disease—the more it is calculated to serve as a Hemœopathic (Hahnemannic) remedy?

No argument seems required to show that, however much likeness there may have originally existed between the symptoms of the disease and those produceable by the action of the remedial agent in its undiluted state, that such similarity has, by excessive dilution of the medicinal substance, long ceased to obtain. Verily, if we are wrong, oh, Paterfamilias, look to your brewer's bill; expend no more your hard-earned cash on treble X; buy single, dilute it well, and learn to know, that its fifth, fifteenth, or fiftieth attenuation, has the same properties, actions, and effects, as your best October.

A few globules equivalent to a millionth part of a grain of Belladonna, will, if taken by a healthy person, produce just no effect at all; how, then, on the principle of Similia, are they likely to prove of service in scarlatina, or other disease having a symptomatic cutaneous eruption? In large doses it is true that Belladonna is said to cause a rash upon the skin, with redness and dryness of the throat and fauces; and so would, indeed, give rise to symptoms *thus far resembling* scarlet fever. The Homœopaths, however, do not so exhibit it, but order it in quantities

whose effects upon the healthy subject would be nil,—inappreciable, or, at any rate, by no means similar.

“ Alas ! to think how people’s creeds
Are contradicted by people’s deeds ! ”

Again, What is likeness? Merely an arbitrary and indefinable quality. A sixpence and a half-crown piece are in many respects alike ; yet offer the former to a Hansom cabman in lieu of a two-shilling fare, and see if its effects upon his general œconomy at all approximate in similarity to the action of the *larger* coin. The carnivorous propensities of certain little creatures impolite to name, gave rise to sensations and appearances not unlike symptoms of disease ; whilst the common stinging-nettle, coming in contact with the skin, produces an eruption so similar to urticaria (nettle-rash), as to have furnished the very name for that disorder. Yet, in their wildest moments, the most bigoted of Homœopaths would pause, we imagine, ere he ordered these as remedial agents.

Nor do Homœopathic medicinal agents,—*not even Charcoal or Lycopodium*,—differ materially from ordinary substances exhibited in infinitesimal quantities. Should the reader wish for personal experience of the effects of the

millionth part of a grain of Charcoal or of Arsenic, he may, with perfect safety, swallow the dose, nor fear injury, however delicate his organization.

“ When, in the treatment of a disease, the wrong remedy
“ has been selected,—*i.e.*, a remedy which is not in accor-
“ dance with the said law (Similia),—no effect will be
“ produced, even though the entire contents of one of the
“ small boxes usually contained in the Homœopathic boxes
“ of medicine have been swallowed.” *

In spite of this testimony to the harmless nature of Homœopathic remedies, we have a few words of caution to offer those fervent converts and amateur physicians, who walk abroad, seeking, not whom they may devour, but some one—any one—willing to devour their globules. They may not, it is true, prove active agents of destruction ; but their benevolence and enthusiasm will not always prevent their actions, passive though they be, from aiding the destructive onroads of disease and death.

We would not willingly wound the feelings of any ; but, reader, should it have been your misfortune to have attempted the alleviation of disease with the most harmless of globules, and, after all, to have suffered the mortification

* Dr. Laurie.

of having to call to your aid (so-called) “Allopathic” interference; still worse, should that “Allopathic” interference have been postponed until too late, we beg of you, pause ere you again prescribe, nor suffer valuable time to pass in futile and trifling interference, when early and rational aid may prove efficient.

Disease may be said to consist in some deviation from the natural sensations or actions of the living body; such functional disorder being either independent of, or accompanied by, organic alteration.

These deviations from healthy or natural conditions depend upon derangement of vital force, and constitute examples of altered vital action; they may arise from causes directly affecting the suffering organs, or such as primarily influence the nervous centres, or produce disorder of the circulating fluids.

The symptoms of disease in any tissue are always examples of increased, decreased, or deranged function; and these alterations in the functional activity of organs and tissues will, if violent or long-continued, give rise to mischief in the part affected.

Medicinal substances also possess the power of producing phenomena of a corresponding character with disease; thus their action is modified by the same causes—degree

and continuance; they each give rise to alterations of vital action (which are exhibited in symptoms), and be this evinced in superfunctional activity or the contrary, reaction is equally a consequence or effect.

This similarity of action between therapeutical and natural agents is, however, no argument in favour of Similia. Two like forces acting in the same direction do so with increased power; thus medicines having a similar action with the disease give rise to "dangerous aggravations," and it is only when two *contrary* forces of equal power are *opposed* that equilibrium is perfect.

Alternation of effect is common to both disease and medicines; the secondary effect, or stage of re-action, being exactly opposite in character to the primary action. Therefore, as during the progress of a disease its action is changed, its effects and symptoms different, so a remedy similar in action to the primary stage of disorder may prove beneficial when reaction has taken place; or a remedy of like nature to the secondary diseased action may prove curative, *because contrary*, in the primary stage; but there will still be no greater contrariety between the primary and secondary actions of the disease, than between the nature of the remedy and that stage of disorder in which its power is curative.

Let us suppose that the system generally is suffering from the effects of some morbid influence, as typhus fever. This will be denoted by symptoms differing not only as to the severity of the infection, the age, strength, and constitution of the patient, &c., but more particularly according to the stage of the disease. Thus, if in the first stage, we shall observe the varied symptoms denoting excitement of the vascular and disturbed functional activity of the nervous system, "the patient is hot, flushed perhaps, and thirsty, and he has a frequent and hard pulse. Besides this he manifests indifference and stupor; his senses are blunted; his intelligence is diminished."* Does it not strike you at once that these, the ordinary symptoms of the first stage of typhus, are precisely similar to those following the imbibition of a large quantity of stimulants? Should we, then, fly to these as remedies on the principle of Similia? Decidedly not. Exhibited *now*, they would without doubt produce a most dangerous aggravation. True, we do administer stimulants in typhus, but it is when the action of the disease is changed in character, and the symptoms exhibit quite opposite phenomena; when nervous debility has

* Sir Thomas Watson.

succeeded to nervous excitement; when there is no longer evidence of increased, but rather of diminished vascular action; when, in short, symptoms are present diametrically contrary to those following the exhibition of stimulants in health.

Medicinal substances we have before mentioned as having a primary and secondary action, such actions differing more as they are exhibited in greater or less quantity, and under varied circumstances.

Let us, for example, take Opium. Given in a dose sufficiently large, it produces sleep. Will, then, a large dose, such, in fact, as would give rise to symptoms similar to those present in an apoplectic comatose condition, improve or restore a person so situate? Or will a small dose, such as would act as a stimulant and excitant in health, be a fitting quantity to compose the wakeful victim of delirium tremens? Constipation is the ordinary consequence of the administration of this drug; it may, however, under certain circumstances, and in certain definite conditions, produce an entirely contrary effect. Again, it may give rise to or relieve sickness, cause or cure headache or delirium, augment or diminish secretion, &c., &c.; its action depending upon the how, when, and wherefore of its administration. Thus to say that any medicine is of

necessity curative, under all circumstances, in any disease, is simply nonsense.

Let us take an example of the practical working of Similia; or, more properly speaking, let us endeavour to obtain an insight into the nature of Homœopathists' ideas of similarity. "The peculiar property," writes Dr. Laurie, "which *Cantharis*, or Spanish blistering fly, possesses of creating a severe burning pain, followed by the effusion of watery fluid beneath the scarf-skin, bears so close an analogy to the effects of a burn or scald, with the formation of vesication or blisters, that we can readily conceive it well adapted, according to the Homœopathic law, to be an admirable remedy in lesions of the said description."

At first sight this appears exceedingly feasible; but when we come to the practical application of this "admirable remedy," we are somewhat startled at our directions and its mode of action. We are to use "the second attenuation of the tincture of *Cantharides* in weak brandy," and pieces of linen saturated with this *highly vesicant* and attenuated tincture "ought to be as frequently renewed as the patient desires," it being of great importance, in severe cases, that the continuous application should be proceeded with throughout the

“ first night after the accident.” Now, when we consider that the second attenuation of the tincture of Cantharides contains something less than one drop of the original tincture to the pint, and when we know that weak brandy, applied in the manner directed, quickly evaporates, we see at once that this great *Homœopathic* remedy resolves itself into a simple evaporating or *cold lotion*.

Again, as an instance of the varied action of remedies depending upon the mode of their application, and as also showing the *ingenuous* and *reliable* nature of Homœopathic assertions and provings, let us suppose a person to have been exposed to such an amount of cold, frost or snow for instance, and for such a length of time, as to have caused what is commonly known as frost-bite. For this condition the proper treatment consists in the application of such means as are capable of producing a moderate degree of reaction, and to accomplish this object we commence by *rubbing* the frost-bitten part with snow, and, as vitality returns, we substitute cold water for the snow, and employ a greater amount of friction, and so on, until sufficient reaction has taken place.

This is one of many Homœopathic practices imputed to us by the disciples of Hahnemann. You apply cold, say they, to cure a condition produced by

cold. What reasoning!—what scientific knowledge!—what wisdom! to uphold a “divine truth.” Know ye not, *ye profound and learned doctors*, who claim such deep insight into the principles of Nature, that cold is but a relative term? Are you not aware that friction calls forth caloric? And can you not perceive that we use the snow and the water to counteract and moderate the *heat* produced by friction? Heat, therefore, it is, we bring to bear upon the frozen part, moderated by the cold water and the snow, less excessive reaction should give rise to inflammation.

But were it otherwise; did we indeed cure cold with cold, what has that to do with Similia? You, yourselves, ignore curing sames by sames, lest you be requested to remove diseases by the aid of those very agents affecting their production, and are necessitated to the indefinite distance of similarity; yet, you would hold forth as an instance that “likes by likes are cured,” the imaginary case of cold being cured by cold. Oh! fie! at least be honest, though you seem to own

“Where ignorance is bliss, ’tis folly to be wise.”

Here then, it is, that practitioners of Rational Medicine differ from the disciples of Hahnemann. They study the action of morbid agents on the various tissues; learn from

Physiology and Pathology the alterations in function and structure arising from disease ; and, from such data, elucidating the reason of these changes, seek in the *known* and *proved* action of remedies, to prevent, resolve, or palliate the abnormal conditions which give rise to symptoms.

“ Slave to no sect, who takes no private road,
But looks through Nature up to Nature’s God.”

Not so the followers of Hahnemann. They profess to be guided and to judge from symptoms only, forgetting that *similar* symptoms may be indicative of many dissimilar conditions ; whilst, lighted by that *ignis fatuus* Similia, they administer remedies which they chose to think capable of producing like symptoms in health, but which are equally liable to give rise to effects of an entirely contrary nature.

“ Here she beholds the chaos dark and deep,
Where nameless somethings in their causes sleep,

Here one poor word a hundred clenches make,
And ductile dulness new meanders takes ;
There motley images her fancy strike,
Figures ill-pair’d, and similes unlike.”

But not content with the endeavour to palm off their “ Great Something ” as a scientific system, they wish to take still higher ground, and claim for it acknowledgment as a truth of Divine origin.

A truth to be divine must be of universal application ; less than universal, it ceases to be truth. Is then Similia a truth of universal application ? Will any known medicinal agents induce a diseased condition similar to croup, diabetes, peritonitis, &c., &c. ? And, if so, will such medicines cure these diseases ? Who will dare to answer this, straightforwardly, in the affirmative ? Are these diseases, then, incapable of relief or cure from medicine ? By no means, but Similia is evidently a very imperfect principle.

Again, I ask the Homœopaths a question. Is colchicum of benefit in gout, or quinine in ague ? If so, how is it that you are unable to cause with these medicines, given in any manner, symptoms similar to ague or to gout ? Are there, then, two, *and two contrary* principles in Medicine ?

“ Homœopathy is either a huge lie, or a Divine truth.”

But we shall no doubt be asked, how is it that *cures are effected* under Homœopathic treatment, if its principles and its practice are so entirely opposed to reason and to common-sense ?

Not for one moment do we deny that *recoveries* may, and doubtless do, take place in Homœopathic practice. But, gentle reader, if you are a convert to Similia, more par-

ticularly if you have—or, what is much the same thing, if you fancy you have—been benefited by an infinitesimal dose, are you prepared to hear it hinted that you would, probably, be in an equally satisfactory state of health had your globules been omitted?

Time, Faith, and Nature, rank foremost amongst curative agents; essential to all systems. Homœopathy has much to be thankful that they exert their kindly influences alike impartially in favour of scientific Medicine, and the vilest Empiricism.

Truth to say, Civilization, which has done so much towards ennobling mankind, has brought with it not only greater appreciation of the refined and the intellectual, but, from the excitement and over-straining of the mental faculties to which it has given rise, in the pursuit of knowledge, of pleasure, and of wealth, and from the unnatural and artificial habits it has encouraged, it has laid the foundation of much bodily disease.

Allowing these facts, it is not difficult to understand how avoidance of undue excitement, and the return to habits and pursuits of a natural character, by removing the causes at work in the production and maintenance of disease, may not unfrequently, alone, or under any

expectant mode of treatment, prove capable of relief and cure.

“ Know, all the good that individuals find,
Or God or Nature meant to mere mankind,
Reason’s whole pleasure, all the joys of sense,
Lie in three words, health, peace, and competence.
But health consists with temperance alone.”

We know that Homœopathic practitioners have a most decided objection to acknowledge the greatness of their obligations to abstinence and dietetic regulations, though they strongly insist upon the necessity of following certain rules whilst under their system of treatment; they would have their patients to consider the avoidance of certain articles of food, &c., as necessary to the action of their remedial agents—in other words, that they place their veto against them, because they would counteract the effects of some potent globule; whereas these very errors of diet are not infrequently *the cause* upon which the disease is dependant.

Amongst the *few* things these gentlemen proscribe, may be enumerated, green or strong black tea, coffee, malt liquors, wine, spirits, and stimulants of every description; lemonade, acid, or alkaline drinks; natural or artificial mineral waters; pork, young meats, ducks

geese, eels, salmon, shell fish; all kinds of salted, pickled, potted, or smoked fish; stimulating soups, high seasoned or rich made dishes; onions, garlic, eschalots, asparagus, radishes, horseradish, celery, parsley, mint, sage, mushrooms, tomatoes, cucumbers, beet-root, and cresses; acids, mustard, pepper, pickles, salads, and melons; nuts of every description, confectionery, pastry, and honey, &c., &c.

Abstinence to the above extent, especially in the case of those who are given to the luxuries of the table, cannot fail, *in all cases*, to produce no inconsiderable effect or alterative action in the system; whilst, in the minor or more trivial disorders, and in those arising from the ingestion of indigestible substances, the avoidance of these agents is, no doubt, *alone*, capable of ensuring a natural and favourable termination.

Orthodox practitioners are not unmindful of the value of temperance, but differ inasmuch as their prohibitions in diet are not quite so indiscriminate, but guided rather by the nature and circumstances of individual cases.

But Faith, and the efforts of the imagination, we opine, are the chief benefactors of those wondrous globules. We smile at the remembrance of our forefathers' credulity and superstition; but it is very questionable if their belief

in talismans, amulets, and charms ; in love philters, and nativities, the king's cure, or the rubbing and tickling of Greatrakes ; to say nothing of the liniment of Long, the painted nails of Perkins, and the mummeries of Mesmer ; were more ridiculous and puerile than the many impostures of our own times.

That many of these so-called systems have partaken, nay, do partake, much of the ridiculous, is certain ; yet, because, rather than in spite of this, they have proved in their day successful. “These apes’ tricks are the main
“ cause of the effect, our fancy being so far seduced as to
“ believe that such strange and uncouth formalities must
“ of necessity proceed from some abstruse science. Their
“ very inanity gives them reverence and weight.”*

Whatever can impose upon the mind belief,
May to the body prove a source of good,
For “ in one interest body acts with mind.”

Although from amongst the ignorant and the feeble-minded, Homœopathy, like all other false systems, must ever look to recruit its ranks, yet there remains another class of persons, whose very education, strange to say, renders them obnoxious to the wiles of falsehood and

* Montaigne.

of quackery. An imposture not only requires for support much specious reasoning, but its acceptation is mainly dependent upon the partial knowledge in the possession of its dupes ;—believing themselves wise they feel themselves competent judges upon any subject, and the pseudo-science put forth as argument by the promulgators of some new doctrine, touching some chord in the circle of their acquirements, overpowers by its vibration their sense of prudence. One fact which they have learned, as, for instance, the transmission of magnetic influence, impresses upon them the conviction that the argument it is made to favour must be true.

Thus it is with the converts to Homœopathy : they read and listen to certain scientific facts—tortured and twisted to agree with Similia—until, from knowledge of the truth of the examples, they place implicit confidence in the theory deduced. The greater their acquaintance with other branches of Science, the more they are enabled to comprehend and appreciate the truth of facts ; but totally ignorant of the principles of scientific medicine, they know not that these are entirely inapplicable as examples of actions they are required to attest. Let such enquire and study the principles of Medicine ; the scales will then drop from their eyes ; ignorance banished, they will understand

and see, and imposture stand revealed in all its unblushing impudence.

As we have so generously acknowledged an efficacy in Homœopathic treatment (not in Homœopathy), we would crave attention to a few words in favour of the “old method.”

Orthodox Medicine is not infrequently credited with a mortality “not all its own.” Few persons are content to rely on globular medicine when undoubted indications of danger present themselves. It may, they think, do well enough when there is little the matter; but when critical symptoms appear, they fly, by instinct as it were, to the old system! That this application to scientific medicine is sometimes unavailing, is not so much a reproach to rational medicine, as to that system through which much valuable time and opportunity has been sacrificed—the season of action—whilst yet energetic measures might have proved successful. It is a frequent boast of Homœopathic practitioners that their success under the new is much greater than that they enjoyed under the old system of practice. We are quite ready to believe that some of them may, *in more ways than one*, have been unsuccessful in ordinary practice; but let them not imagine that *this truth* is capable of but one interpretation. An old wife given to quackery gains more or less reputation according to the

instinct she displays in the selection of suitable cases, whilst the greater her success in their treatment—or, what is more nearly the truth, the less killed by her specifics—will depend materially upon the greater or less potency of the remedies employed. The intellect which can grasp *and believe* the Hahnemannian doctrines is scarcely of that order the most fitted to understand and apply orthodox medicine. Edged tools are unseemly for children; to a master they may prove instruments of value; the unlearned in their use may find them dangerous.

Ordinary remedies and doses are not only powerful to cure, but, misapplied, equally powerful to kill.

Enough, if not more than sufficient, has been said concerning the theory and practice of the Hahnemannian disciples, and were it on this alone that the Homœopathic professors founded their title to consideration, we had finished. Not so, however: the majority, alas! depend for respect upon licences and diplomas from those very colleges whose teachings and principles they affect to despise.

They feel that the public know and respect the “Allopathic” credentials; nor do they fail to appreciate the value of instruments which connect them, no matter how remotely, with the “good men and true,” whose sign-manual they bear—names alike brilliant in literature, honoured in medicine, and endeared to science.

Let these gentlemen remember how these testimonials were obtained—let them call to mind their then voluntary profession of rational principles, nor forget the solemn promises they registered, to uphold and maintain the dignity of the institutions from which these emanated—then, considering the manner in which their actions have borne out their professions, and fulfilled their trust, let their consciences acquit them—if they will.

If, in their method there resides that intrinsic merit they profess, why not cast from them these badges of connection with a system which they condemn and affect to despise? No law exists to prevent any one from calling himself a Homœopathist, or practising as such: let them, therefore, avow themselves openly; surely they need not shame of so great a master!—and boldly affixing to their doors, “Mr. So-and-So, Homœopath,” trust in their system and the gratitude of a British public for patrons, and in British credulity for fees.

That they might thereby be disabled from granting the necessary certificates of death, is the only reasonable objection that can be offered to this suggestion. Be that as it may, orthodox qualifications are unfittingly made use of to guarantee the legality of Homœopathic practice.

Thus have we robbed Similia of its trappings,
Its base assumptions, and presumptuous ravings;
And, viewing thus its native nothingness—
Behold *this* “*Great Something*”—NAKED LIES.

APPENDIX.

HOMŒOPATHIC STATISTICS.

The official returns of Dr. Fleischmann's hospital at Vienna now figure prominently in every Homœopathist's manifesto, and, to the general reader, the figures, doubtless, afford conclusive evidence of the advantage of the Homœopathic method. Not so to those who understand anything about hospital statistics, or who have read the admirable essays of Drs. Routh, Gairdner, Simpson, &c. Dr. Griffin shortly sums up the results of part of their enquiry:—"The mortality from all diseases at Fleischmann's hospital during the years 1835 and 1843 was 6·4 per cent, and the number of cases was 6,501 during that period. The mortality in Edinburgh Infirmary during the years 1842 and 1843 was 12 per cent., and the number of cases treated was 6,369."

"Here we have about the same number of cases treated in the two hospitals; but the mortality in the Edinburgh Hospital is twice as great as that in the Homœopathic institution. Is this mortality in the Edinburgh Hospital due to bad treatment, and the limited mortality in the

“ Homœopathic hospital due to good treatment? It is not.
 “ Mortality depends upon the nature of the cases admitted.
 “ If there are many dangerous cases admitted to one
 “ hospital, and few to another, the latter must naturally
 “ have a comparatively limited mortality. Let us contrast
 “ the nature of the cases in Fleischmann’s hospital with
 “ those admitted to the Edinburgh Infirmary. Consumption
 “ is an incurable disease, as admitted by Fleischmann
 “ (Journal of Homœopathy, vol. i., p. 31), and of his 6,501
 “ cases, 98 were consumptive; while, in the Edinburgh
 “ Hospital, there were 276:—

“ Of Palsy	at Vienna	5	At Edinburgh. .	103
“ Organic Diseases of the Heart	„	15	„	159
“ „ „ „ Liver	„	1	„	33
“ Bright’s Disease	„	0	„	82
“ Diabetes	„	0	„	17
“ Internal Aneurisms	„	1	„	18
“ Malignant Tumours	„	0	„	55
		<hr/>		
“ Total .		120	Total .	743

“ Thus we have an insight into the cause of a limited
 “ mortality, and apparent success. Of incurable cases,
 “ Fleischmann had less than 2 per cent.; Edinburgh more
 “ than 11 per cent.

“ Cases of External Injury at Vienna .	52	At Edinburgh. .	641
“ Surgical Operations	0	„	150

“ We have, then, at Vienna 52 cases of severe injury, and
 “ at Edinburgh 791 cases (including surgical operations),

“ and, as a whole, $6\frac{1}{2}$ times more incurable cases at Edin-
 “ burgh than at Vienna, and 15 times more cases of external
 “ injury at the former than at the latter ; 170 serious and
 “ incurable cases in the Homœopathic Institution, 1,534 of
 “ the same character in the other. In which should we
 “ expect a large mortality? Let us carry the analysis
 “ farther:—

“ Sore Throat at Vienna	301	At Edinburgh. . .	34
“ Chicken-pox	110	“	2
“ Tetters	20	“	1
“ Influenza	52	“	0
“ Total	483	Total	37

“ Thus, we find that while the serious diseases under
 “ Dr. Fleischmann’s care were but one-ninth of those of the
 “ Edinburgh physicians, the trifling cases at Edinburgh were
 “ but one-tenth of those treated at Vienna. We need not
 “ wonder that there was only a death-rate of 6 per cent.
 “ under Fleischmann’s, but we are astonished that there was
 “ such an enormous death-rate as he shows. If anyone,
 “ comparing the reports of Fleischmann’s hospital with
 “ those of our great city institutions, and observing the
 “ nature of the cases admitted to the one and the other,
 “ asserts that the results of the former, as compared with
 “ the latter, are more satisfactory, he wilfully shuts his eye
 “ to the truth. I have contrasted this famous Homœopathic
 “ hospital with two of our great institutions situated as they

“ are in the very centre of destitution, and other circum-
 “ stances dangerous to life, and have shown the fallacy of
 “ a supposed superiority in the Hahnemannian system of
 “ treatment. 6·4 per cent. was the mortality of Fleisch-
 “ mann’s hospital with all its advantages of position, selection
 “ of cases, and mistakes in that very simple rule of arith-
 “ metic—addition. But I am not yet satisfied with Fleisch-
 “ mann’s hospital statistics. Look at the following table,
 “ and consider the tale it tells:—

				Mortality.	
				Per	
				Died.	Cent.
				Treated.	
“ Chester General Infirmary	1826-1835	5,331	220	4.1	
“ Kent and Canterbury Infirmary	1793-1826	15,697	655	4.1	
“ Exeter Hospital	1826-1835	10,145	326	3.2	
“ Lincoln Hospital	1826-1835	2,762	133	4.8	
“ Addenbrook’s Hospital, Cambridge	1826-1835	6,414	157	2.4	
“ Leeds Infirmary	1766-1859	252,937	8,276	3.27	
“ Total—				293,286	3.3
“ Fleischmann’s Homœopathic Hospital		6,501		6.4	

“ Here, then, the Homœopathic treatment is brought face
 “ to face with the reports of six hospitals in this country,
 “ and shows a mortality twice as great. The reports of the
 “ Leeds Infirmary extend over ninety-three years, and
 “ embrace a total number of cases of 253,937, with a mor-
 “ tality of 3·27 per cent., an average of 2,719 per annum.
 “ Fleischmann’s extend over nine years, with an average of
 “ 733 per annum.”

SO-CALLED HOMŒOPATHIC REMEDIES.

“ It is a common impression that the favorite Homœo-
 “ pathic remedies — belladonna, aconite, camphor, nux

“ vomica, &c., were originally introduced by Homœo-
 “ pathists, and still continue their exclusive property.
 “ . . . These drugs were in use long before Hahne-
 “ mann dreamed his dream.”—Dr. Roberts.

Dr. Hempel, Professor at the Homœopathic Medical College, Pennsylvania, and a great authority amongst Homœopathists, says, “ the Homœopathic law of *like cures like*, is only an *apparent truth*, and therefore in many cases without any practical value.” “ The same drug is invariably” (according to the Homœopathic materia medica) “ a remedy for constipation and a remedy for diarrhæa, a remedy for strangury and a remedy for the opposite state, enuresis : a remedy for a loss of appetite and for a ravenous desire for food ; for excessive menstruation and for retention of the menses ; opposite states, such as far-sightedness, near-sightedness ; emaciation and adiposis ; sleeplessness and drowsiness ; desire for and aversion to food ; excessive thirst or loss of thirst ; pale or flushed face ; dryness of or discharge of mucus from the nose ; and a variety of other states, are almost invariably found among the symptoms of most of the important drugs in the Homœopathic materia medica. Let us examine the subject a little more closely, and it will at once become apparent that the material basis of

“ Homœopathy, viz., the provings or drug symptoms which
“ make up the Homœopathic materia medica, so far from
“ constituting a series of incontrovertible facts, is, on the
“ contrary, liable to the grave and well-founded charge of
“ being in a great measure a tissue of *fallacies, illusions,*
“ *misapprehensions, absurdities, and childish observations.*”
Strong language this from a Homœopathist.

Dr. Griffin, of Southampton, very cleverly illustrates some of these absurdities. He says:—“ But, to my mind,
“ the grandest discovery, not of this or any age, but of
“ Hahnemann, and the one which I think to be the brightest
“ gem ‘ in the immortal crown ’ which surrounds his deified
“ brow, is not ‘ the law of similars,’ nor the ‘ totality ’ of
“ symptoms, nor yet the medicinal disease which is so much
“ stronger and yet so much weaker than the natural one ;
“ nor is the development of ‘ spiritual ’ medicinal powers
“ by dilution and trituration ; nor the fact that alcohol by
“ dilution does not acquire that same marvellous ‘ spiritual ’
“ force ; nor yet is it the ‘ infinitesimal ’ dose itself, great
“ as it is, which demonstrated the truth of all the others ;
“ but it is the astounding magnitude of the intellectual
“ force which conceived that a single *smell* of a single
“ decillionth dose would not only cure as well, and as
“ certainly, as if it had been swallowed, but maintains all

“ its virtues undiminished for years, and after hundreds
 “ have been cured by an ‘olfaction!’ There is just as
 “ little doubt about this dogma as about any other which
 “ Hahnemann gave to the world. It, like the others, is
 “ founded upon the result of solid experience, and eighteen
 “ years of that, too, ‘unparalleled;’ I unhesitatingly
 “ admit; and, of course, *not to be refuted by any expe-*
 “ *rience in the world.* You have already seen what marvel-
 “ lous efficacy a single ‘smell’ possessed in the case of
 “ insanity—an ‘olfaction’—and straightway the man is
 “ cured in two hours!

“ Why do we not see the benefits of this astounding
 “ discovery appearing on every side? There is no longer
 “ any need to send to prison an abusive woman, as do
 “ certain of our magistrates, when we know that aconite
 “ produces an irresistible desire to blaspheme and swear!—
 “ (is it not written in Jahr?)—and we know further, that,
 “ by a single olfaction thereof, in the thirtieth dilution,
 “ she becomes another woman in two hours! Is it not
 “ written in Hahnemann (after eighteen years of solid
 “ experience?) There would be space in the Church if
 “ those who argue for and against Dr. Temple knew that by
 “ a single olfaction of the thirtieth dilution of *gold* and
 “ *veratrum*, all excessive scruples of conscience, and

“praying about religious matters, would be completely
 “removed in two hours! For is the knowledge of it not
 “the result of eighteen years ‘unparalleled,’ ‘solid,’
 “experience by Hahnemann? Every church in the land
 “would be filled to overflowing if our clergy knew that an
 “olfaction of *colocynth* in the thirtieth dilution cures the
 “want of all religious feelings! While despair of
 “eternal salvation would be completely dissipated by
 “a single sniff of *pulsatilla*, although this must be
 “cautiously used, because it also cures ‘continual praying’
 “and ‘devout aspect.’” (Jahr, vol. i. p. 468).

FALSE OR “MONGREL” HOMŒOPATHY.

I would recommend innocent people who believe in the
 theory of Hahnemann, and think that, when under the
 care of his followers, they are treated Homœopathically,
 to read a pamphlet, entitled “Homœopathy as practised
 in Manchester, contrasted with its alleged principles,” by
 Dr. Roberts, wherein he gives many *fac-simile* prescrip-
 tions by so-called Homœopathic practitioners, and, also,
 otherwise proves how these gentry practice one thing and
 yet preach the contrary. I have taken the liberty to
 make a few extracts from his essay.

“If we turn to the books published for the guidance of
 “domestic homœopathic practice, we find in all of them a

“ table of the medicines to be used, with the dilution in
“ which they are to be administered. In
“ not one of them (seven guides were under consideration)
“ is there any mention of a dose stronger than a millionth
“ of a grain. (A millionth of a grain—the third dilution
“ of Hahnemann. . . . This quantity of the most viru-
“ lent poison known could be swallowed every five minutes
“ or indeed every minute, throughout the day, and for an
“ indefinite number of days, without provoking any
“ appreciable symptom whatsoever.) ‘I fell in with
“ patients who had been under the care of homœo-
“ pathists, but who, I found, had been treated in the
“ usual way; and the patients so treated had not the
“ slightest suspicion that they had not been treated
“ homœopathically. It is only exceptionally
“ that homœopathists assume the common style of prescrib-
“ ing; usually they adopt a method which is incomprehen-
“ sible to the ordinary druggist, by which large doses of
“ powerful medicines may be, and are, prescribed in perfect
“ concealment. Consider, now, what would
“ be thought of a medical writer who should recommend
“ in his published works a drop of castor oil or a grain of
“ Epsom salts for a dose; but who should, in his actual
“ treatment of the sick, always prescribe a couple of tea-

“ spoonfuls of the former, or an ounce of the latter. This
 “ is a very faint illustration of what our homœopathists
 “ do.” “ There is one delightful
 “ feature in popular literature of homœopathy; and that
 “ is its perfect inward accord. Homœopathy appears there,
 “ as a finished temple of science, where all is certainty and
 “ and exactitude—principles settled—practice uniform—
 “ results invariable—no disputed points—no diversities of
 “ opinion. It is but a dream, however; when you turn to
 “ that small section of homœopathic literature which is
 “ solely meant for the eye of the homœopathic practitioner,
 “ you are rudely awakened to the dissonant reality. In
 “ the pages of the ‘British Journal of Homœopathy,’ in
 “ the reports of discussions in the congresses of homœ-
 “ opathic practitioners, in the works of Hempel and Hen-
 “ derson, a far different picture is presented. Harmony
 “ and unanimity are no longer visible; in their stead reign
 “ discord and contradiction. Legitimate medicine is some-
 “ times reproached with its differences, but they are small
 “ compared to the perplexities in the homœopathic camp.
 “ Our differences lie mostly in the selection of our medi-
 “ cines; on matters of dose and administration we are in
 “ comparative accord; but homœopathists differ flagrantly
 “ on every point where an issue can be raised.”

“Under one pretence or another, homœopathists are
“beating back to the paths of legitimate medicine, and
“various devices are put forward to cover their retreat.”

“Infinitesimal doses have been exchanged for palpable
“quantities; and the drug symptoms of the Homœopathic
“Materia Medica prove to be a pathless maze, where no
“law, even if it were a true one, could possibly operate.
“The natural consequences have ensued; namely, a wide-
“spread adoption by Homœopathic practitioners of the
“same remedies in the same diseases as the ordinary
“practice of medicine has sanctioned. Imitation is the
“homage that error pays to truth.”

Yet the immortal Hahnemann taught that “the suitable-
“ness of a medicine for any given case of disease does not
“depend on its accurate Homœopathic selection alone, but
“likewise on the proper size, or, rather, *smallness* of the
“dose;” insisting upon the very smallest doses in the
following somewhat striking language:—“The very
“smallest, I repeat; for it holds good, and will continue
“to hold good, as a homœopathic therapeutic maxim, *not*
“*to be refuted by any experience in the world*, that the best
“dose of the properly selected remedy is ALWAYS the
“VERY SMALLEST one, in one of the high dynamisations
“(X or the thirtieth dilution), as well for chronic as for

“ acute diseases,—a truth that is the *inestimable property*
 “ of pure homœopathy, and which, as long as allopathy,
 “ and the new MONGREL system, made up of a mixture of
 “ allopathic and homœopathic processes, is not much
 “ better, continues to gnaw like a cancer at the life of
 “ sick human beings, and to ruin them by large and ever
 “ larger doses of drugs, will keep pure homœopathy
 “ separated from these SPURIOUS arts as by an impassable
 “ gulf.” Who, reading this, can wonder that the plaster
 busts of the “ great master ” wear a forbidding frown ?

A HOMŒOPATHIST'S REASONS WHY THE SYSTEM OF HAHN-
 [NEMANN IS NOT UNIVERSALLY ADOPTED.

“ We have endeavoured in this brief sketch to place
 “ before our readers what we consider to be the actual
 “ position of Homœopathy in Therapeutics, and the great
 “ advantage which it furnishes over the more ancient forms
 “ of treatment. It may be urged, How comes it that, if all
 “ you say is the truth, all practitioners are not Homœopaths ?
 “ The answer is simple. Vested interests stand in the way,
 “ medical trades' unionism, bigotry, intolerance, and ignor-
 “ ance. Old practitioners enjoying lucrative practices, con-
 “ ducted on the so-called “ orthodox ” system, are naturally

“very much opposed to innovation. Trades’ unionism in
“medicine is rife, whereby the ancient colleges and schools
“combine to brand as unworthy of professional courtesies
“all physicians who dare to secede from their antiquated
“tenets. Bigotry and intolerance are well displayed in the
“conduct of the members of the old school, who lose no
“opportunity of maligning and misrepresenting Homœ-
“opathy and its adherents. Lastly, the great obstacle is
“ignorance. Not one Allopathic practitioner in a hundred
“could (as is evident from their remarks on the subject)
“give even a fair definition of what Homœopathy really
“means. The Allopathic press, too, whilst making attacks
“on Homœopathy has not the courage to advocate putting
“the matter to the test of experiment; and further its
“editors obstinately refuse to admit into their pages the
“replies to their attacks.” Homœopathic Medical treat-
ment: what it is, and what it does; by Charles Robert
Fleury, M.D., etc., etc., etc. 1869.

Considering the fact that this pamphlet was originally published (in 1861) in consequence of the “Medical Circular” having thrown open its pages to all and every homœopathist who chose to defend his principles therein, the last assertion of Dr. Fleury, if not “unscrupulous,” is, at any rate, an error.

“Homœopathists,” says Dr. Roberts, “sometimes
 “taunt us: ‘Why do you not put our system to the
 “proof?’ My answer is: We put it to the proof our-
 “selves, and see it put to the proof in others in multitudes
 “of cases, and we witness no results. Every day both the
 “public and the profession are re-enacting the ‘provings’
 “of Hahnemann without perceiving the symptoms he
 “describes. Let me take, as an example, common kitchen
 “salt (natrum muriaticum). This when proved upon a
 “healthy person, is said to produce above four hundred
 “and fifty symptoms, and some of them of great severity.
 “. Silica, or flint—of which we are taking
 “daily minute doses in every draught of water, and in
 “every morsel of bread, is alleged to produce eighteen
 “closely printed pages of prominent symptoms, and yet
 “WHO FEELS THEM?”

THE REAL REASON WHY WE DON'T ALL TURN

HOMŒOPATHS.

The Homœopathists (advertising their Lectures in the *Times*), have the assurance—to use a mild term—to invite medical gentlemen to give them a hearing; this is, probably, with the public, who know no better, a very taking “proof” of generosity on their part. The following,

from "The Medical Press and Circular," Oct. 27, 1875, may possibly enlighten them why we don't all rush in a body to take advantage of the gratuitous teaching offered to us. The "lady of *high rank*," and the "banker advanced in years," are not so telling with the profession as they ought to be.

"Capacious Deglutition."

"The homœopathic mind must be peculiarly constituted
"in that it appears to be totally insensible to the ludicrous
"and the improbable, and it would seem to be an impos-
"sible task to produce any story sufficiently indigestible
"for the astonishing degree of credulity which is developed
"in its professors. In a recent address of Dr. Bayes to
"the British Homœopathic Congress, we find the following
"statements:—'Some individuals are so sensitive to mer-
"cury, that I have known an instance where even the
"twelfth dilution (*i. e., the quadrillionth part of a grain,*)
"could not be given without inducing mild salivation and
"great discomfort. So also the sensitiveness of some
"patients to the action of arnica is most instructive. Two
"still more extraordinary cases have also occurred in my
"experience. In one, the patient (a banker advanced in
"years) was threatened with cerebral congestion, for

“ which I prescribed arnica. He warned me that arnica
“ always caused erysipelas with him. “ In that case,”
“ I said, “ I will give you such a dose as cannot possibly
“ produce such an accident ;” and I ordered him the 18th
“ dilution. Next day he had decided swelling and erysi-
“ latoid rash round the mouth and affecting specially the
“ upper lip. I have also another patient, a lady of high
“ rank, whose sensitiveness goes even far beyond this.
“ Her husband and children, fond of field sports, and, of
“ course, consequently liable to troubles both from fatigue
“ and from accidents, use by my advice a small quantity of
“ arnica in their bath after an unusually tiring day, or an
“ arnica lotion or compress for bruises or strains. But,
“ under those circumstances, if they go into the same room
“ where Lady —— is, either after the bath or after using
“ the lotion, she invariably has slight erysipelas of the
“ face, with puffiness of both eyelids and great irritation of
“ the skin. Her last attack of the kind was induced by
“ her having thoughtlessly mixed a dose of a dilution of
“ arnica for her husband, one drop of which fell on her
“ finger, and although she immediately washed it off, she
“ had erysipelas in the face next day.’

“ How can any medical sect claim to rank as scientific
“ investigators when they vow a belief in such nonsense

“ as this ? A couple of spoonfuls of infinitesimal solution
 “ of arnica are mixed with, say, twenty gallons of water,
 “ a small portion of this solution is applied to the skin, and
 “ then rubbed thoroughly dry. We are asked to believe
 “ that the stray atom which has escaped removal is capable,
 “ by transmission through the bather’s clothes, and by
 “ unexplained dissemination through the atmosphere of a
 “ large room, of an attack of well-pronounced erysipelas.
 “ After this, the bottled sunbeam-water which an American
 “ homœopath recently discovered to be an active thera-
 “ peutic agent is worthy of belief.”

The late Professor Simpson, of Edinburgh (Homœo-
 pathy, its Tenets and Tendencies,) says :—“ I have in my
 “ possession a letter from an eminent London physician,
 “ one whom, I believe, the Homœopathists themselves
 “ would acknowledge to be a most accurate observer and
 “ reasoner, and a man of the most disinterested candour.
 “ He for some time watched and studied, in the London
 “ Homœopathic Hospital itself, the evidence to be gained
 “ for or against homœopathy, in the results of the treat-
 “ ment of the sick under the Hahnemannian doctors
 “ attached to that Institution, and his conclusion, he
 “ writes me, is this :—‘ Everything in it, and out of it,
 “ fully confirms the view, that, as to *practice*, HOMŒOPATHY
 “ IS TRULY A NONENTITY.’ ”

If it were otherwise, drug bills for the army and the navy, for the hospitals and the dispensaries, for the unions and the general practitioners, would soon be things of the past; for, sixpennyworth of any drug, *with proper succussion*, would serve the world as long as it shall last. Alas! the wholesale druggists thrive, and fear not.

THE DANGER OF HOMŒOPATHY.

“There are numerous cases in which spontaneous recovery is out of the question; in which sometimes the life and death of the patient, and at other times the comfort or discomfort of his existence for a long time to come, depends on the prompt application of active and judicious treatment. In such cases Homœopathy is neither more nor less than a mischievous absurdity; and I do not hesitate to say that a very large number of persons have fallen victims to the faith which they reposed in it, and to the consequent delay in having recourse to proper remedies.”—Letter from the late Sir Benjamin Brodie to *Fraser's Magazine*.

Dr. Roberts (*Homœopathy in Manchester*) writes:—
“The administration of mercury to salivation by the direction of Homœopathic practitioners has come twice under my personal cognizance.” And amongst the pre-

scriptions of Homœopathic practitioners quoted in his work, is one ordering 10 drops Solut. Morph. Hydrochlor. every half-hour. “This tremendous dose (10 drops) every half-hour soon produced the desired effects. But the attendants not satisfied with this, procured a second bottle (without the knowledge of Mr. ———), and administered it as perseveringly as the first, until drowsiness passed into stupor, and stupor merged into profound coma, and at length death. An inquest was held on the body, on account of the suspicion of poisoning; and undoubtedly the woman died from the direct effects of morphia, albeit the peritonitis seems to have been of such severity that final recovery could scarcely have been expected from it. No blame was attached to the medical man, because, had his instructions been carried out, no harm would have resulted. I do not quote this case with a view of imputing censure to the medical attendant concerned; the death occurred, no doubt, from misadventure; but I quote it in order to show what justice there is in the plea sometimes put forward in favour of Homœopathic practitioners that ‘if they do no good, at least they do no harm.’ The patient of an ordinary practitioner knows well enough that he is dealing with no fanciful weapons, and if unexpected incidents arise, he

“ is on his guard ; but not so the patient of a Homœopathist ;
 “ he imagines and understands that he is taking infini-
 “ tesimal doses, which have a spiritual rather than a material
 “ power so long as the medicines are colourless and
 “ tasteless (as was the case in the incident just quoted)
 “ there would be nothing to awaken his suspicion. Which
 “ of the two stands safer ? ”

AMATEUR HOMŒOPATHISTS AND THE ESTIMATION IN WHICH
 THEY ARE HELD BY THEIR PROFESSIONAL FRIENDS.

“ When, some time ago, alluding to amateur Hahneman-
 “ nic doctors, female and male, Dr. Madden, of Brighton,
 “ a distinguished homœopathic physician, thus spoke of
 “ *their* credulity and *their* cures : ‘ Their credulity ! Oh !
 “ the wonders which they heard of daily, as affected by
 “ amateur practitioners (of homœopathy) ; and what *were*
 “ these in the vast majority of cases ? SIMPLY NATURAL
 “ RECOVERIES, IN WHICH THE ALL-POTENT GLOBULES TOOK
 “ NO SHARE.’ Such boasting (observed Dr. Madden) did
 “ infinite injury ; it might for a time convince the public,
 “ but the profession saw through the flimsy triumph, and
 “ at once concluded that all their cures belonged to the
 “ same class.”—Homœopathy, its Tenets, &c.

AN AMATEUR HOMŒOPATHIST'S OPINION OF CONVERTED
HOMŒOPATHIC MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

“It is (observes Mr. Everest), if the truth must be told, “a national calamity, and nothing else, when a doctor is “converted. Armed with his diploma, he plunges *in medias res*, gives pilules, drops, aconite water ; mistakes aggrava- “tions of the natural disorder, and plays almost as many “pranks with the little single medicines as he did with the “compound ones.” And Mr. Everest (the personal friend and disciple of Hahnemann) upbraids most modern homœopathic medical practitioners, as knowing indeed little or nothing of the proper practice of homœopathy, or the principles of Hahnemann, and as consequently committing “hideous” and “fatal” mistakes in the practical application of the system of Hahnemann. For “modern homœopathy (observes this reverend author) rushes through all the Sage’s precautions, like a mad bull through a field of flowers.”—Simpson, opus cit.

